

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 23, 2000

LB 936

business standpoint, just to give you, Senator Chambers, I'll tell you a little bit about my life outside of this building is that I happen to be the owner of a law firm that employs 16 people in Omaha, Nebraska. And about a year ago we decided to look into employee leasing. And one of the reasons why we looked into that is because it's becoming harder and harder to compete with some of the larger companies, and an employee leasing arrangement allowed us as a law firm to actually lease our employees, to provide them with better health insurance benefits at a cheaper cost to the employer; and then also the retirement benefits that Senator Wickersham talked about also, we were able to institute a plan that benefitted all of our employees. In addition, they took over a lot of our payroll functions and so it actually is a benefit to smaller companies to enter into these employee leasing arrangements. And, quite frankly, I don't consider it chattel or cattle or however it was, because actually I am a leased employee myself. So, if you want to put a face on the leased employee, you can just look at me. And I would entertain any questions or anything like that, but it's not a big, evil leasing company going out and leasing people as cattle, it's actually an arrangement that benefits the employees and it also benefits the smaller employers, such as myself.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Quandahl. Senator Bohlke, on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members. Senator Quandahl talked a great deal about what I was going to speak about from the bill last year. Senator Chambers, it seemed when we discussed the bill last year we explained that it was twofold--one, it would allow companies to provide benefits to employees; and, two, though it does provide some cost savings to those companies if they don't have to hire someone to do the bookkeeping. So your point being that, if you are not going to offer benefits, then it tilts the table more to the fact that it would be a cost savings for the companies that we are "incenting" with the bill. However, if the possibility would be there that they'd offer benefits, you are insuring at least the possibility that those employees would receive better benefits with the way the bill stands. However, I think you pointed out that they are not required to offer benefits under this bill,